

Remarks/Arguments

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zimmerman (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0093789), in view of Imazeki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,535,164, hereinafter "Imazeki"), in view of Schwoegler (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0030624).

It is respectfully asserted that none of Zimmerman, Imazeki, or Schwoegler, alone or in combination, disclose:

"a processor operative to automatically enable a network connection, responsive to said emergency alert signals, to a source of information related to the emergency alert function and retrieve updated information related to the emergency alert signals included on a tuned frequency by said emergency alert function,"

as described in claim 1.

A problem addressed by the subject application is the need for updated information related to an emergency alert function of a television signal receiver. Current devices for receiving emergency alert signals are unable to keep track of new transmitters, and changed FIPS location codes. As a result, such devices may not operate using the most up-to-date information available, and therefore may not provide consumers an acceptable degree of protection in emergency situations. (Specification, lines 4-8)

To solve this problem, the subject application discloses a television signal receiver which obtains updated information associated with the emergency alert function, such as, but not limited to, geographical area information and/or transmission frequency information, and stores the updated information in memory. Such updated information enables the emergency alert function of the television signal receiver to be performed with the most up-to-date information available. In some embodiments, the processor automatically enables a connection between the television signal receiver and a website

designated by the user during the setup process whenever the emergency alert function is activated. The user may then interact with the designated website through the browser and thereby cause updated information associated with the emergency alert function to be downloaded to television signal receiver and stored in memory. For example, the website may include maps that enable the user to select one or more geographical areas of interest and cause updated information, such as new FIPS location codes and/or new transmission frequencies, corresponding to those areas to be downloaded to television signal receiver. (Specification, page 10, line 26 through page 11, line 13)

Zimmerman teaches a system “for monitoring broadcast content and generating notification signals as a function of subscriber profiles and methods of operating the same. According to an exemplary embodiment, a monitoring system is introduced that is capable of identifying special event content within a plurality of broadcast content streams, each of the plurality of broadcast content streams having detectable content attributes. The monitoring system is operable to (i) sense a content change within at least one of the plurality of broadcast content streams as a function of the detectable content attributes, (ii) detect the special event content broadcast within the at least one of the plurality of broadcast content streams as a function of the sensed content change, and (iii) selectively generate a notification signal as a function of the detected special event content and a subscriber profile.” (Zimmerman Abstract)

As admitted in the Office Action, “the combined teachings of Zimmerman and Imazeki fail to teach the limitation of a processor operative to automatically enable a network connection, responsive to said emergency alert signals, to a source of information related to the emergency alert function and retrieve updated information related to the emergency alert function aid information associated with the emergency alert function with said updated information.” Similarly, Zimmerman fails to disclose retrieving such updated emergency alert information over a network connection. Thus, Zimmerman fails to disclose “a processor operative to automatically enable a network connection, responsive to said emergency alert signals, to a source of information related to the emergency alert function and retrieve updated information related to the emergency alert signals included on a tuned frequency by said emergency alert function,” as described in currently amended claim 1.

Imazeki teaches an emergency broadcast receiver which enables a “current area code” to be updated automatically. The receiver of Imazeki uses a GPS receiver to obtain current position information. Then, a converter converts the current position information into an area code by use of a conversion table to write the area code into a code memory. (Imazeki Abstract).

Again, as admitted in the Office Action, “the combined teachings of Zimmerman and Imazeki fail to teach the limitation of a processor operative to automatically enable a network connection, responsive to said emergency alert signals, to a source of information related to the emergency alert function and retrieve updated information related to the emergency alert function and information associated with the emergency alert function with said updated information.” Furthermore, Imazeki only describes updating an area code based upon location data obtained from a GPS receiver. Imazeki does not describe retrieving updated information regarding an emergency alert function over a network connection. Furthermore, any update in Imazeki is not responsive to receipt of emergency alert signals, but instead based upon a detected change in location. Thus, Imazeki, like Zimmerman, fails to disclose “a processor operative to automatically enable a network connection, responsive to said emergency alert signals, to a source of information related to the emergency alert function and retrieve updated information related to the reception or processing of said emergency alert signals included on a tuned frequency by said emergency alert function,” as described in currently amended claim 1.

Schwegler teaches an “individualized, location specific weather forecasting system in which the location of an electronic device is detected; and weather data is generated and transmitted to the electronic device so that subscribers receive weather forecast data specific to their current location.” (Schwegler Abstract)

While Schwegler does describe transmission of weather data to an electronic device over a network, it does not describe accessing over a network updated information related to the processing of emergency alert signals on a tuned frequency. Schwegler also

fails to disclose enabling a network connection responsive to tuned emergency alert signals. Thus, Schowegler, like Zimmerman and Imazeki, fails to disclose “a processor operative to automatically enable a network connection, responsive to said emergency alert signals, to a source of information related to the emergency alert function and retrieve updated information related to the emergency alert signals included on a tuned frequency by said emergency alert function,” as described in currently amended claim 1.

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that there is no 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure provided by Zimmerman, Imazeki, or Schwoegler, alone or in combination, that makes the present invention as claimed in claim 1 unpatentable. It is also respectfully submitted that currently amended independent claims 11 and 21 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Since dependent claims 2-10, 12-20, and 22-30, are dependent from allowable independent claims 1, 11, and 21, it is submitted that they too are allowable for at least the same reasons that their respective independent claims are allowable. Thus, it is further respectfully submitted that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Having fully addressed the Examiner’s rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant’s representative at (609) 734-6804, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian J. Cromarty/

By:

Brian J. Cromarty
Reg. No. 64018
Phone (609) 734-6804

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312
November 24, 2009